arXiv:1212.3130v1 [math.AP] 13 Dec 2012

RESPONSE TO A QUESTION OF YANYAN LI AND LUC NGUYEN IN THEIR PAPER "A COMPACTNESS THEOREM FOR A FULLY NONLINEAR YAMABE PROBLEM UNDER A LOWER RICCI CURVATURE BOUND", ARXIV:1212.0460.

XU-JIA WANG

Abstract. In this note we answer a question raised by Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen in their paper "A compactness theorem for a fully nonlinear Yamabe problem under a lower Ricci curvature bound", arXiv:1212.0460.

1. **Introduction**

In their paper [LN], Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen questioned the proof in my paper with Neil Trudinger [TW], see page 5, line 4 of the paper [LN]. The purpose of this note is to clarify our proof and also answer the question raised by them. We hope this note can also help other readers to understand that part of paper [TW].

2. **Quotation from paper** [TW]

Yanyan Li pointed out that he has difficulty to follow the proof of the following part, which is copied from paper [TW], only the underlined sentence was added today.

Lemma 3.4 *Let $w = \lim_j w_j$ be as above. Then near 0, we have*

$$w(x) = 2\log|x| + o(1), \tag{3.29}$$

where $h(x) := w(x) - 2\log|x| = o(1)$ is in the sense

$$\underline{\lim_{r\to 0} r^{-n}\int_{\{r<|x|<2r\}} |h(x)|dx = 0,} \tag{*}$$

and $w_j \to w$ in $W^{1,p}$ for any $p \in (1, \frac{n}{n-1})$.

Proof. In a normal coordinate system at 0, let $y = c_m x$ and $w_m(y) = w(x) + 2\log c_m$, where c_m is any sequence of constants converging to infinity. Let $\widetilde{w}_m$ be the corresponding minimal radial function of w_m. Then by (3.28),

$$\widetilde{w}_m(r) = 2\log r + o(1). \tag{3.30}$$

Hence by passing to a subsequence, we have $\widetilde{w}_m \to 2\log r$.

For any fixed $\hat{r} > 0$ small, let y_m be a point with $|y_m| = \hat{r}$ such that $w_m(y_m) = \widetilde{w}_m(\hat{r})$. We may assume that $y_m \to y_0$. Recall that (Lemma 2.2) w_m is locally uniformly bounded in $W^{1,p}$ for any fixed $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$. Hence locally w_m converges to w_∞ in $W^{1,p}$ $(1 < p < \frac{n}{n-1})$ and w_∞ is an admissible function defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Similarly $\widetilde{w}_m$ converges to a limit function $\widetilde{w}_\infty$. By (3.30) we have $\widetilde{w}_\infty(x) \equiv 2\log r$. By the definition of minimal radial function, $w_m \le \widetilde{w}_m$. Hence $w_\infty \le 2\log r$.

Let $v_\infty = e^{-\frac{n-2}{2}w_\infty}$. Then v_∞ is super-harmonic and $v_\infty(x) \ge |x|^{2-n}$. Note that the function $|x|^{2-n}$ is harmonic. Therefore by the comparison principle, the function $v_\infty(x) - |x|^{2-n}$ must either be positive or it is identically zero. But on the other hand, since $w_m(y_m) = \widetilde{w}_m(\hat{r})$ and by definition, $w_m \le \widetilde{w}_m$, the function $w_m - \widetilde{w}_m$ attains its local maximum 0 at y_m. Hence the function $v_m - \tilde{v}_m$ attains its local minimum 0 at y_m. By (3.30) and Corollaries 2.2 and 2.3, $\tilde{v}_m$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{v}_\infty(x) = |x|^{2-n}$ near y_0. By Lemma 2.2, v_m converges to the super-harmonic function v_∞. Apply Lemma 2.1 to $v_m(x) - |x|^{2-n}$ in a small ball centered at y_0 and sending $m \to \infty$ we obtain $v_\infty(y_0) = |y_0|^{2-n}$. Hence by the comparison principle as indicated above, $v_\infty \equiv |x|^{2-n}$, namely $w_\infty \equiv 2\log r$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let x_j be the absolute maximum point of v_j. As above we may assume x_j is a fixed point and $x_j = 0$. By Lemma 3.4, the function w_j given in (3.11) converges in $W^{1,p}$ to the function w in (3.29). We need to show that 0 is an isolated singular point of w.

If there is a sequence of singular points $x_m \in \mathcal{M}$ of w which converges to the point 0, we may choose $c_m = |x_m|^{-1}$ in the proof of Lemma 3.4. Then the limit function w_∞ has at least two singular points, one is the origin 0 and the other one is $x^* = \lim x_m/|x_m|$. To see that x^* is a singular point of the limit function w_∞, we use Lemma 3.3 and observe that the constant C in (3.24) is uniformly bounded from above (Remark 3.3). But the proof of Lemma 3.4 shows that $w_\infty = 2\log r$. This is a contradiction.

Therefore the absolute maximum point is an isolated singular point. By the same argument we can show the next maximum point is also isolated, and furthermore the set of all isolated singular points of w has no limit points. For if there is a sequence of singular points $y_m \to 0$, we may for each $m > 1$ choose a conformal normal coordinate with origin at y_m and consider the sequence $x_m = y_{m+1} - y_m$ (regarding y_m as points in the Euclidean space, using the exponential map). The above argument also leads to a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

3. **Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen's question**

On November 3rd, 2012, I received the following question from Yanyan Li.

> *We have recently been reading your paper "The intermediate case of the Yamabe problem for higher order curvatures" IMRN 2010, pp 2437-2458, and have difficulties in understanding the proof of Lemma 3.4 on page 2455. To us, what the proof*

> *establishes is that*
>
> $$h(x) := w(x) - 2\log|x| \tag{1}$$
>
> *satisfies, for every* $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$*, that*
>
> $$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\left\{ r^{-n}\int_{B_r(0)} |h|^p + r^{p-n}\int_{B_r(0)} |\nabla h|^p \right\} = 0. \tag{2}$$
>
> *We do not see why this implies*
>
> $$\lim_{x\to 0} h(x) = 0 \tag{3}$$
>
> *which is what Lemma 3.4 asserts.*

They also gave a complicated example which they said satisfies conditions of Lemma 3.4 but the conclusion of the lemma.

From their email, they interpreted $o(1)$ in (3.29) in the sense (3) but the proof of Lemma 3.4 only gives the convergence in the sense (2), which implies (*). Note that (3) and Theorem 1.3 are equivalent. Namely if $o(1)$ in (3.29) is in the sense (3), then 0 is an isolated singularity and Theorem 1.3 is proved (so the part "Proof of Theorem 1.3" above is not needed and should be canceled in the paper).

I am sorry that in the original paper, the meaning of $o(1)$ was not given and the notation is misleading. I also point out that with the meaning of $o(1)$ interpreted as above (in the underlined sentence), the proof in [TW], as quoted in §2 above, is fine.

4. My response to Yanyan Li's question

In my email replied to Yanyan Li, I explained how to get (3) by using the "Proof of Theorem 1.3". I attach my email of November 14 herewith, as it may help other readers to understand our proof (I omitted the non-mathematical part).

> *Your question is that in the proof of Lemma 3.4, the convergence is in* $W^{1,p}$ *for some* $p < n/(n-1)$*, and our conclusion is that the convergence is locally in* L^∞*.*
>
> *My answer is that with the convergence in* $W^{1,p}$*, if the function h (h is the function in your note) is locally uniformly bounded, then the interior gradient estimate or the Harnack inequality (for locally bounded solutions) implies the convergence is locally uniform.*
>
> *If h is not locally uniformly bounded, then by Lemma 3.2, away from the origin, there is a point where h attains its max and converges to infinity. Then by the second paragraph of page 2456, which is right after the proof of Lemma 3.4, one arrives at a contradiction.*
>
> *We should have included the second paragraph of page 2456 in the proof of Lemma 3.4.*
>
> *Your example is not a solution and so one cannot use the interior gradient estimate or the Harnack inequality (for locally bounded solutions).*

The idea in my email is to use the proof of Theorem 1.3 to get (3), as Theorem 1.3 and (3) are equivalent. My answer may not be perfect, as much of my attention was dragged to their example and I didn't point out the formula (*) in my email. The above email is pretty clear to myself. If it is not clear enough to them, it is not difficult to clarify it by further emails. However strangely Yanyan Li was very reluctant to communicate with me. Let me recall recent emails with him.

- On November 3rd, 2012, Yanyan Li sent me an email with an attachment, in which he asked the question as shown in (1)-(3) above, and also gave a complicated example of more than two pages and said that his example satisfies conditions of Lemma 3.4 in paper [LN] but does not satisfy the estimate (3).
- I replied a short email immediately and replied another one with more details in the early morning of November 4th.
- However Yanyan Li didn't reply my email. So on November 14th I sent him another email (as shown above), which in math is similar to my email of Nov 4th. He replied on Nov 16th and said that he discussed with Luc Nguyen and he still doesn't understand. I replied immediately asking him to tell me precisely which step he doesn't understand.
- Again Yanyan Li didn't answer my email. So I asked a friend at Princeton to ask Nguyen face to face what is their question and ask him to email me directly. I was then told that Nguyen didn't understand Lemma 3.4 but he does not want to email me.
- I asked my friend to contact Nguyen again, making clear precisely what they don't understand. However before they can meet the second time, Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen posted the paper [LN] on arXiv on Dec 3rd.

After they posted the paper on arXiv, Yanyan Li told me on Dec 5th that he gave a talk on the results in [LN], in a conference in Paris in the week Nov 5-9. That means he asked me his question when he almost finished his paper, only two days before the conference. Certainly he could have asked me much earlier. I wouldn't have posted this note on arXiv had he consulted me properly, or had he not posted his paper in arXiv, or had he not questioned the proof openly. As he is an expert in conformal geometry, his remark in [LN] is apparently saying my paper [TW] is incorrect, so I have to make this explanation.

I also point out that he is the editor of IMRN who accepted our paper [TW] for publication in IMRN.

5. **Comments on Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen's paper** [LN]

In paper [LN], Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen's re-proved the results of paper [TW]. Their proof uses all the key ideas in [TW], such as the Liouville Theorem, the gradient estimate, the Bishop theorem, and in particular the idea of minimal radial function introduced in [TW]. Though they relaxed the nonnegative Ricci curvature condition at one stage but other key ideas remain the same. Therefore they were only able to treat the same class of equations as in [TW]. Though their theorems and proofs are written in a little bit different way, I cannot see the main result in their paper applies to any other equations of some interest other than those in paper [TW]. So I cannot see any real value of the paper [LN] to the subject.

I would appreciate it if they could find a substantially different proof of the result, or if they can extend the compactness result to more general problems such as the k-Yamabe problem for $1 < k < \frac{n}{2}$.

REFERENCES

[LN] Yanyan Li and Luc Nguyen, A compactness theorem for a fully nonlinear Yamabe problem under a lower Ricci curvature bound, arXiv:1212.0460.

[TW] Neil Trudinger and Xu-Jia Wang, The intermediate case of the Yamabe problem for higher order curvatures, International Mathematics Research Notices, Vol 2010, no.13, pp 2437-2458.

XU-JIA WANG: CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, CANBERRA, ACT 0200, AUSTRALIA.

E-mail address: `Xu-Jia.Wang@anu.edu.au`.